

in the abolition of free lunch would not amount to much and that there would be more appreciable savings to Government if the members gave up a substantial part of their daily allowances at this juncture.

MR. G. MALLANNA thought that the cutting down of the *menu* on the first day of the session was responsible for the observations made by Mr. Mahomed Sait and that otherwise he would not have advocated the abolition of lunch.

MR. MAHOMED SAIT replied that the members were there as representatives of the people to render real service to the country and that they would not mind if the tiffin arrangements were abolished. He felt that there could be no real objection to the stoppage of free lunch on the distinct understanding that the savings accruing from this small self-sacrifice on the part of the members would be set apart for primary education as already indicated by him.

MR. P. SUBBARAMA CHETTY was of opinion that people coming from outside places could not starve for 5 hours with an interval of barely half an hour and as such, it was not desirable to abolish the present practice. If, however, it had become necessary to effect some economies, he suggested that the cost of lunch might be deducted from the daily batta given to the members.

A large number of members did not, however, subscribe to this view.

MR. KRISHNAPPA GOWDA endorsed the views of Mr. Mahomed Sait.

THE DEWAN observed that there was no use discussing the matter further in view of the divergent opinions expressed.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

MESSRS. HANUMEGOWDA, VEEREGOWDA (Dodballapur Taluk) and T. SIDDALINGIAH (Dodballapur Municipality).—

Q.—1. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) Whether as promised in the June Session (*vide* Question 49) information has been obtained regarding the exact cost of measurement of each *hissa* under the Record of Rights Scheme and if so, what would be the average cost per *hissa*?

(b) Whether it is justifiable to recover from the raiyats more than the actual cost incurred therefor?

R.A.

(c) Whether, as prayed for above, the fees have been reduced to one rupee per *hissa* in respect of survey numbers measuring more than one acre and annas eight on survey numbers less than one acre?

(d) During the June Session, Government were pleased to intimate that items 2, 3 and 4 relating to Question 49 were under investigation and that orders would be passed on receipt of reports called for. Are the replies given to Questions 2, 3 and 4 satisfactory notwithstanding that Government were approached with interpellations and representations in Dasara and June Sessions?

(e) Did it not work as a hardship in regard to the payment of fees in places where *phod* work has already been done?

(f) Is it a fact that the fees levied for measurement of lands in villages exceeded the revenue demand of such villages?

(g) In the present times of financial stringency when much difficulty is being felt in paying even the revenue assessment, is it justifiable in burdening the raiyats with such excessive fees—more than the revenue assessment?

(h) Has the fee been reduced even now to one rupee if the survey number is more than one acre, and eight annas, if less?

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT.—

A.—1. (a) *Hissa* survey has been completed in five taluks and two sub-taluks so far. The average cost of measurement of a *hissa* roughly amounts to Rs. 1-6-7.

(b) The fee prescribed for entries involving measurement of fields is Rs. 2 at present. This includes also the cost of work done in the Revenue Department, in the initial and final stages, of forms and stationery, remuneration to Patels and Shanbhogues, etc. There is therefore no profit to Government out of the collections.

(c) No.

(d) *Vide* answer to (b) above.

(e) No instances have come to notice of Government.

(f) There are some instances of this kind.

(g) The *hissa* jamabandi bears no relation to the Land Revenue jamabandi. Concession regarding payment of *hissa* fees was ordered by Government.

Vide Press Communique No. 2258-78—P.O. dated 22nd April 1931.

(h) *Vide* answer to (b) above.

It is not, however, possible to fix the fees on the basis of the extent of *hissas*.

Supplementary Questions and Answers.

Mr. Veeregowda.—

With reference to answer to (b), will the remaining Re. 0-9-5 be sufficient to cover the cost of other items referred to?

First Member of Council.—

I think so.

Mr. Veeregowda.—

What are the details for the expenditure of Rs. 1-6-7 referred to in (a)? Does it include the cost of coolies employed?

First Member of Council.—

As already stated, it is for the establishment of the Survey Department and also for the coolies.

Mr. Veeregowda.—

When the coolies are actually provided by the raiyats, why should Government employ them?

First Member of Council.—

We have not got all these details now. If you want details with regard to any particular place, we can furnish them to you separately.

Mr. Veeregowda.—

When a large number of items mentioned in (b) cost only Re. 0-9-5, the expenditure of Rs. 1-6-7 on the Survey Establishment seems very high. Cannot full details for this expenditure be given?

First Member of Council.—

We shall give them if necessary.

Khan Bahadur Mahomed Abbas Khan.—

Have not Government promised to reduce the fee from Rs. 2 to Rs. 1-8-0?

R.A.

First Member of Council.—

We may be able to reduce it as the work gets more systematised. Experience, however, shows that it is not possible at present.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

What is the basis for the calculation of the average expenditure of Rs. 1-6-7 ?

First Member of Council.—

The total expenditure divided by the number of *hissas* gives you the average cost.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

Are not the Government making a profit from the levy of the fee ?

First Member of Council.—

They are not. Please see the budget. We find that the levy of Rs. 2 is not excessive. If we employ a larger number of trained measurers and regulate the work properly, it may perhaps be possible to reduce the fee.

Mr. D. S. Mallappa.—

Will you reduce it ?

First Member of Council.—

We want to do it. But it is a matter of some time. We shall consider.

Mr. B. L. Byanna.—

Have you entertained additional hands for the land record work ?

First Member of Council.—

Certainly.

Mr. Hanume Gowda.—

Is the cost of the employment of coolies included in the average of Rs. 1-6-7 ?

First Member of Council.—

If coolies were actually employed, the expenditure would have been included in the average.

Mr. Hanume Gowda.—

As a matter of fact, all these coolies are provided by the raiyats themselves, and the department spends nothing on them. Would it not be possible to obtain the coolies through the agency of the Patels free of cost?

First Member of Council.—

It may not be possible.

MESSRS. B. L. BYANNA (Bangalore City Municipality) and
B. M. MUNISAMAPPA (Bangalore Taluk).—

Q.—2. Will the Government be pleased to place on the table:—

(a) A statement showing the travelling allowance and honorarium drawn every month by the Presidents and Vice-Presidents of all the District Boards in the State for the year ending 1930-31?

(b) The amount spent by the several District Boards on (1) road works, (2) well works, (3) buildings, and (4) other sundry works during 1930-31?

(c) The number of days and miles that the said Presidents and Vice-Presidents in the State toured in the respective districts during 1930-31?

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, GENERAL DEPARTMENT.—

A.—2. (a) No honorarium is granted to the Presidents and Vice-Presidents of the several District Boards. A statement showing the travelling allowance and conveyance allowance drawn every month during 1930-31 by the Presidents and Vice-Presidents of the several District Boards is placed on the table. (*Vide* Appendix III).

(b) and (c) Statements showing the details required are placed on the table (*vide* Appendix III).

Supplementary Questions and Answers.

Mr. B. L. Byanna.—

Are not the District Board Presidents of the status of Deputy Commissioners?

Second Member of Council.—

There is no such definition.